

THE INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ZOOLOGICAL
NOMENCLATURE: RESULT OF VOTE ON PROPOSALS
FOR SUBSTANTIVE AMENDMENTS
(SECOND INSTALMENT)
Z.N.(G.) 182

By the Secretary, International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature

In *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36 (2), pp. 66-70 a report was published on the first instalment of the Commission's vote on the Editorial Committee's proposals for substantive amendments to the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. That instalment of the vote concerned some of the proposals that had been published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34, pp. 167-175; others of those proposals were then reserved for further consideration by the Editorial Committee.

2. All the proposals that had reached the Committee were discussed by the Commission at its special meeting at Stensoffa, Sweden in August 1979, when the Ecological Field Station of the University of Lund was put at our disposal by the kind offices of Professor Per Brinck. A report from that meeting was presented through the general meeting of the Commission at Helsinki to the Section on Zoological Nomenclature of the Division of Zoology of IUBS. As already reported elsewhere (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 224) the Section authorised the Commission to vote on the outstanding proposals in due course and to incorporate the results of the vote into the Code.

3. Two further voting papers were accordingly sent out in February 1980. The first of these, V.P.(80)1, concerned the matters reserved for further consideration from the first instalment of the vote. The second, V.P.(80)2, concerned proposals that had been published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35 (2), pp. 77-87, October 1978. The matters submitted for a vote in these voting papers are set out below. Each voting paper was accompanied by an appendix in which comments received by the Editorial Committee on the proposals were summarised. These appendices are also reproduced here.

V.P.(80)1

Vote No.	Article in Code	Commission Report to Section on Zoological Nomenclature, Helsinki, 1979, Section B.	V.P.(79)1 Number
1	Art. 8 Publication	6. That printing by ink on paper be no longer obligatory among the conditions that constitute publication. The provision that confines publication for the purposes of the Code to works printed only in ink on paper (Article 8(1)) would be removed because by modern technology other methods of printing are now common and, moreover, some of them may only be distinguished with difficulty from works produced by customary techniques. The question is part of the broader issue of what should constitute publication for the purposes of the Code and of the criteria of availability.	3
	Art. 9 Publication	7. That the following be listed as methods that do not, if employed, constitute publication:	3
2		(a) handwritten material at any time, and if reproduced as such by a mechanical process after 1930	
3		(b) photographs as such except micro-card and microfiche	
4		(c) computer print-outs as such	
5		(d) photocopies as such (e.g. xerography and other indirect electrostatic reproductions) unless such a method is used to reproduce a work that satisfies Article 8	
6		(e) acoustic tapes and other acoustic recordings as such.	
		The provisions relating to publication present particular difficulty, mainly because the existing provisions do not reflect recent advances in printing technology that greatly facilitate the production of numerous identical copies of works that may meet the criteria of publication established in Article 8 of	

Vote No.	Article in Code	Commission report to Section on Zoological Nomenclature, Helsinki, 1979, Section B.	V.P.(79)1 Number
		the Code. In an attempt to exercise some control over the quality of works, these methods would be added to those currently listed in Article 9.	
7a	Art. 30a	13. That adjectival epithets that are, or end in, Greek or words that are not Latin be treated as indeclinable. The requirement in Article 30 of the Code that an adjectival epithet must agree in gender with the generic name with which it is combined causes difficulty with epithets that are not of Latin origin. Epithets that are or end in Greek words, or words that are not Latin, or that are arbitrary combinations of letters, would be treated as indeclinable.	8
7b	Greek and non-classical epithets		
8	Art. 32d(i) Diacritic marks especially umlauts	18. That in the case of scientific names spelled with an umlaut when originally proposed, if there is any doubt that the name is based on a German word, that it be so treated. It is also proposed that any names proposed with umlauts after the publication of the 3rd Edition be treated by deleting the umlaut irrespective of origin. The Code Article 32 c (i) provides that all diacritic marks on letters in scientific names originally published with such marks are to be deleted, with the exception of scientific names based on German words originally spelled with an umlaut, where <i>ä</i> , <i>ö</i> and <i>ü</i> are replaced by <i>ae</i> , <i>oe</i> , and <i>ue</i> respectively. Article 27 requires names to be spelled without diacritic marks. It is intended that the proposed amendment to Article 32 will encourage zoologists forming new names to transliterate according to some preferred system before publishing them.	11
9	Art. 33d Permissible variants of <i>-i</i> and <i>-ii</i>	20. That in an epithet formed from the genitive of a personal name the subsequent use of the termination <i>-i</i> in place of the termination <i>-ii</i> used in the original spelling (and vice versa) constitutes an incorrect subsequent spelling	12

Vote No.	Article in Code	Commission report to Section on Zoological Nomenclature, Helsinki, 1979, Section B.	V.P.(79)1 Number
		<p>even if clearly deliberate. It is well known that there is divided opinion as to whether such names should be treated as permissible alternatives, or even whether the Code should dictate that only the termination <i>-i</i> should be used whatever the stem. Currently the Code Article 32 requires the original spelling to be used. The Committee does not recommend that this be changed. However, some names that are Latin names or that have been put into Latin form and that correctly terminate in <i>-ii</i> have been emended by dropping one <i>i</i>. Except for purposes of Homonymy (Art. 58(10)) such names may be available where the emendation is deliberate. In order to avoid the seeking out and recording of such variants in synonymies and nomenclators they would be treated as though they were incorrect subsequent spellings and without nomenclatural status.</p>	
10	Art. 72b "type slide" proposal for protozoa.	<p>26. To provide that in extant species of protozoa, when a taxon cannot be differentiated by a single individual, a number of preserved individuals forming, or presumed to form, a clone and presented in a single preparation may be designated as a holotype or neotype, or selected as a lectotype. Such specimens would have the status of such a type (not syntypes). In consequence of full discussion with protozoologists (the International Congresses of Protozoology and Parasitology), provision would be made in Article 73 for a group of individuals to be treated collectively as a name bearer but, unlike syntypes, not further divisible by lectotype selection from among them.</p>	20

(The associated proposal to allow the type of certain species of protozoa, under certain conditions, to be made up of representatives of successive stages of the life cycle was not published until May 1979 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 200-208) and will be presented for a vote in a later instalment.)

Vote No.	Article in Code	Commission report to Section on Zoological Nomenclature, Helsinki, 1979, Section B.	V.P.(79)1 Number
11	Art. 73 a - c Art. 74b "holotype" deemed to be lectotype designation	28. That when a species-group taxon is found to be based upon syntypes and was previously wrongly thought to be based upon a single specimen, or when a single specimen is wrongly thought to have been a holotype, that specimen if previously cited in a published work as a holotype shall be deemed to be a lectotype. The Code Article 73a provides that if a nominal species-group taxon is based on one specimen only, that specimen is the holotype, but if more than one specimen provides the basis, those specimens are of equal value in nomenclature (Art. 73 c). The Code makes no provision to protect the status of a name, previously stable because it was thought to be based upon a holotype, that becomes unstable through the discovery that it is based upon syntypes and vulnerable to subsequent selection of a different specimen as lectotype. Stability would be preserved in such cases by giving the specimen previously thought to be a holotype, the status of a lectotype, but protection against selection through mere listing would be provided through making the provisions of Article 73 a (iii) apply.	19
12	Change in presentation in Code.	30. That the term 'epithet' be adopted for the second word of a binomen and the second and third words of a trinomen. The Special Session has considered the effect upon the Code of adopting the term 'epithet' for the second term of a binomen and the second and third terms of a trinomen. The expressions 'specific name' (as used in the Code), 'name of a species', 'name of a species-group taxon', and 'name of a nominal species-group taxon' do not mean the same thing. The Code's present usage dates back to the old Règles. The Editorial Committee has	2

Vote
No. Article in Code Commission Report to Section on Zoological Nomenclature, Helsinki, 1979, Section B. adopted the term epithet in its published (6th) Draft. The effect upon comprehensibility produced by the proposal can be judged by inspection and comparison.

V.P.(80)2

- 1 Art. 3
(*Araneus* Clerck) 5. To provide that the generic name *Araneus* Clerck and epithets published in combination with it by Clerck in 1757 and made available for use in zoological nomenclature by the International Congress in 1948 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 4: 315-319) would have priority as though they were published subsequent to the starting point of zoological nomenclature and in 1758 before the 10th Edition of the *Systema Naturae*. The Paris Congress decided to incorporate a provision in the Code to this effect, but the London Congress decided merely to make an entry referring to the work in the Official List of Works approved for use in Zoological Nomenclature (Direction 104, 1959, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 17: 89-91). The relative priority of names in *Aranei svecici* and *Systema Naturae* (10th Edn), and the year from which all names date, would be made explicit in Article 3 of the Code 'Starting Point'.
- 2 Art. 10e
(Acceptance of names of both primary and secondary subdivisions of genera) 8. That a provision be added to the criteria of availability of genus-group names to provide that, notwithstanding the existing provision that establishes subgeneric rank for names proposed for certain primary subdivisions of genera, a uni-nominal name proposed for a group of species is not made unavailable solely on the grounds that it was proposed for a secondary (or further) subdivision of a genus or subgenus. The present Article was adopted by the London (1958) Congress to meet a particular situation that did appear upsetting to stability. It is implicit in Article 11 f (ii) that names for secondary (and further) divisions of genera are not available. Considering, however, that such names are widespread, and that as they have been generally accepted, their suppression in toto would be even more disturbing, the restriction to primary divisions, even if only implicit, would be deleted. If a uni-nominal name, duly latinized and capitalized (and not merely a specific epithet), is proposed as a name for a group of species, there is no operational

- | | | |
|----------|---|--|
| Vote No. | Article in Code | Commission Report to Section on Zoological Nomenclature, Helsinki, 1979, Section B. |
| | | difference between it and a name proposed with the label "gen. nov." and hence no reason to treat it as anything other than a genus-group name even if it was labelled as the name of a "Section" or "Division". |
| 3 | Art. 31
(Restoration of Art. 31) | 15. That when an epithet formed from a personal name is a noun in the genitive case it is to be formed according to the rules of Latin grammar if the personal name is treated as a Latin word by the author. When it is not, the genitive is to be formed by adding to the stem of the name <i>-i</i> if it is that of a man, <i>-orum</i> if of men, or of man (men) and woman (women) together, <i>-ae</i> if of a woman, and <i>-arum</i> if of women. The old Règles, Art. 14c, provided, for epithets that are substantives in the genitive, that 'the genitive is formed in accordance with the rules of Latin declension in case the name was employed and declined in Latin', but 'if the name is a modern patronymic, the genitive is always formed by adding, to the exact and complete name, an <i>-i</i> if the person is a man . . .' etc. The 1961 Code, Art. 31, appears to say the same thing, but it omits mention of the genitive: 'A species-group name, if a noun formed from a modern personal name, must end in <i>-i</i> if the personal name is that of a man . . .' etc. At the International Congress of Zoology in Washington in 1963, it was held that this Article required too many changes in the spelling of long-accepted names, and the Article was changed to the Recommendation 31A ('should usually end in . . .') of the present Code. For the sake of promoting consistency in the formation of names the Article would be restored for epithets that are nouns in the genitive case formed from personal names. |
| 4 | Art. 32d(iii)
Correction of family-group names | This proposal was not presented to the Section on Zoological Nomenclature because the corresponding point in <i>Bull. zool. Nom.</i> vol. 35, p. 80 was taken by the Special Session to be merely a corollary of Point 9 in V.P.(79)1 (deletion of Article 29d). |
| 5 | Art. 33b
(Definition of "demonstrably intentional".) | 16. That a change in the original spelling of a name shall only be interpreted as 'demonstrably intentional' (and hence be an emendation) when, in the work itself, there is an explicit statement of intention, or when both the original and the changed spelling are cited and the latter is adopted in place of the former, or when two or more names |

- | Vote | Article in Code | Commission Report to Section on Zoological Nomenclature, Helsinki, 1979, Section B. |
|------|--|--|
| | | in the same work are treated in a similar way. Information derived from an author's or publisher's corrigenda would be admissible. In order to determine whether a change in the subsequent spelling of a name is an emendation (and hence possibly, technically, an available name in its own right) the Code Article 33 a (ii) requires zoologists to determine whether a change is demonstrably intentional. When the change is only implicitly intentional a rigorous test would be made mandatory. |
| 6 | Art. 40
(Status of family-group names based on emended generic names) | 17. That a family-group name based on an unjustified emendation of a generic name is an incorrect original spelling and must be corrected. Under Article 40 it is implicit that, when a family name is found after 1960 to be based upon an invalidly emended generic name, the spelling of the family name continues to follow the secondary form of the generic name, while the name of the type genus reverts to its original form. In such cases the spelling of the name of the family group would automatically change in conformity with that of the type genus. |
| 7 | Art. 59c
(Junior secondary homonyms) | 23. To provide that a junior secondary homonym replaced before 1961 is permanently invalid unless the Commission rules otherwise. The Code Article 59 b (i) stipulates that if the use of a replacement name for a junior homonym replaced before 1961 is contrary to existing usage, existing usage is to be maintained and the matter referred to the Commission. Discretion would be given to an author as to whether to refer such a matter to the Commission. If the author discovering the situation, or another author, considers that the matter should be referred to the Commission, and does so, existing usage would be maintained under Article 80 until the decision of the Commission is published. In the case of junior secondary homonyms that have not been replaced (even if the homonymy had not been overlooked), but are no longer considered to be in the same genus with the senior homonym, replacement would not take place except by a zoologist who believes that the two species-group taxa are congeneric (Art. 59c). |

V.P.(80)1 – APPENDIX

Note 1. The recommendations of the Editorial Committee are referred to by

the letters "EC" and those of the Special Session by "Stensoffa". They were confirmed by the General Meeting of the Commission and by the Section on Nomenclature at Helsinki (see covering letter to V.P.(80)1). Mroczkowski was present at Stensoffa but not at Helsinki; Dupuis was present at Helsinki but not at Stensoffa. Thirteen members were present at both places. At Stensoffa (where the discussions were some of the most lively and constructive that any of us have known), only 12 votes were counted on some points, either because the Chairman did not vote, or because Professor Brinck had been called out of the meeting.

Note 2. In the comments on each proposal, various 'groups' are mentioned. These were meetings of zoologists at which the published proposals were discussed. At the North American meetings, votes were counted. The groups were: London (British Museum (Natural History), zoologists, entomologists including Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, and palaeontologists); Washington (National Museum of Natural History, U.S. Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior, zoologists, palaeontologists and entomologists); Ottawa (Agriculture Canada, entomologists); Houston (Entomological Society of America annual meeting, in an informal group); Kansas (University of Kansas, zoologists and entomologists); and Copenhagen (14 zoologists).

Vote Number	6th Draft Article Number	Subject
1	8	Printing in ink on paper no longer to be obligatory. <i>EC</i> : Recommended <i>Stensoffa</i> : Recommended <i>nem. con.</i> * <i>Comments</i> : Few, and none published. Most accepted the proposal in recognition of modern technology. See also votes 3 (microcard) and 5 (xerography) below.
2-6	9	Methods that do not constitute publication. <i>EC</i> : Recommended <i>Stensoffa</i> : Votes 2, 4 and 6 recommended <i>nem. con.</i> Vote 3: Both EC and Stensoffa agreed that photographs as such should not constitute publication, but that microcard and microfiche should be accepted. Stensoffa recommended that information sufficient to make new names and acts available should be printed in a full-sized publication. (At Stensoffa, 3 voted against their acceptance.)

**Nem. con.* is an abbreviation of the Latin *nemine contradicente*, meaning 'with no contrary vote'. It is not the same as 'unanimous' because some may have abstained in a *nem. con.* vote.

Vote Number	6th Draft Article Number	Subject
2-6 continued (Vote 3)	9	<p><i>Comments</i> (Vote 3)</p> <p><i>For accepting microcard and microfiche</i></p> <p>Washington group (26:14) Brooke, Key, Corliss ('I doubt that z.n. will be weakened at all by publication by microfiche, which is less expensive and is becoming increasingly used for scientific works of merit.') Durham, <i>Bull.</i> 34, p. 9. Jeffords ('The best current publication practices . . . seem to be well on the way to being micro-publishing . . . Such publishing is or will become a practical and economic necessity').</p> <p><i>Against</i></p> <p>Copenhagen group (14), Houston group (11:2), Ottawa group (6:1), Kansas group (6:1). See also <i>Bull.</i> 34, pp. 133-5, vol. 35, pp. 9-10.</p> <p>For general statements of the issue, see <i>Bull.</i> 33, pp. 98-104, 34, p.10, 35, p.15.</p>
Vote 5		<p>Xerography</p> <p><i>EC</i>: Recommended</p> <p><i>Stensoffa</i>: Recommended <i>nem. con.</i></p> <p><i>Comments</i>:</p> <p><i>For acceptance</i></p> <p>Durham (<i>Bull.</i> 34, p. 9), Jeffords (we should keep in step with current printing practice), Steyskal (<i>Bull.</i> 35, pp. 138-9).</p> <p><i>Against</i></p> <p>Washington group (27:7), Kansas group (7:0), Houston group (11:2), Ottawa group (6:1).</p> <p>It was after learning of these contrary votes that EC decided to propose that xerography should be accepted provided that the product satisfied the criteria of Article 8. Stensoffa felt strongly that we should go so far to keep up with modern developments.</p>
7a, 7b	30a	<p>Greek and non-Latin epithets to be non-declinable</p> <p><i>EC</i>: Recommended</p> <p><i>Stensoffa</i>: Recommended <i>nem. con.</i></p> <p><i>Comments</i>:</p>

Vote Number	6th Draft Article Number	Subject
		<p><i>For</i> Brooke, Galbraith, Key, London group, Washington group (12:9), Houston group (7:4), Kansas group (7:0)</p> <p><i>Against</i> Ottawa group (3:2)</p> <p>Steyskal (<i>Bull.</i> 35, pp. 139–141) and one person each in the Houston and Ottawa groups thought that Greek epithets should be declined, but not other non-Latin ones.</p> <p>There seems little objection to treating epithets that are neither Latin nor Greek as indeclinable. The difference of opinion concerns Greek epithets. The weight of opinion that they should be treated as indeclinable came, as might be expected, from North America, but even there, there was opinion the other way. Botanists decline Greek epithets. Past usage in z.n. is variable, so whichever decision we take will lead to changes in the spelling of names — either to decline those that have been treated as indeclinable, or <i>vice versa</i>. Steyskal's thorough analysis should be studied.</p>
8	32d(i)(2)	<p>Diacritic marks</p> <p><i>EC</i>: The Committee had a variety of proposals before it and did not decisively support any.</p> <p><i>Stensoffa</i>: The Special Session considered a number of possible ways of dealing with the difficult problem of diacritic marks in z.n., including the adoption of the International Standards Organisation method in ISO.833/1974. After prolonged debate, three alternatives were presented for voting, with the understanding that a member who voted for the first was not precluded from voting for the second or third alternative if he was convinced by the continuing discussion.</p> <p>The three propositions and the votes on them were: (1) that as from 1 Jan. 1758 either some diacritic marks should be provided for in the Code (8 in favour) or none at all (5 in favour); (2) that the 1964 Code be restored with modifications to bring it nearer to ISO.833/1974 (9 in favour); and (3) that the method here proposed be adopted. This last proposition was recommended <i>nem. con.</i></p>

Vote Number	6th Draft Article Number	Subject
		<p><i>Comments:</i> These were varied and complicated, and there was disagreement on the facts. There was general objection to the 'unless' clause ending the provision in the Sixth Draft, and this need not be considered further.</p> <p>The Sixth Draft proposed to extend the existing Code provision to cover Scandinavian diacritics. The comments 'against' listed below include some who opposed any rule on the subject whatever and those who thought all diacritics should simply be deleted.</p> <p><i>For</i> Silfverberg (<i>Bull.</i> 35, pp. 146-7, in part), Copenhagen group, Galbraith, Kansas group (5:2), Heppell, Corliss, Mayr, Kerzhner</p> <p><i>Against</i> Brooke (<i>Bull.</i> 35, p. 85), Bolton <i>et al</i> (pp. 144-5), Holthuis, Key (delete whole provision), London group (retain Code), Washington group (27 for deleting all diacritics, 11 for retaining Code, 9 for Sixth Draft), Houston group (11:0 - 6 favoured deleting whole provision), Ottawa group (5:0), Brooke, Dyte (retain Code), Cowan, 3 Polish zoologists, Crosskey (retain Code), Hahn (wrong to equate German and Scandinavian marks).</p> <p>Note that the old <i>Règles</i> provided no rule; they merely recommended that authors forming new names from personal names written sometimes with ä, ö or ù and sometimes ae, oe or ue, should use ae, oe or ue. Many names have been proposed or amended accordingly, and many changes would be necessary if that Recommendation were reversed. The Stensoffa proposal is a compromise that aims to preserve past usage while laying down a simple rule for the future - and one that appears to suit majority opinion.</p>
9	33d	<p>-i and -ii as permissible alternatives</p> <p><i>EC:</i> Recommended against permissiveness.</p> <p><i>Stensoffa:</i> Rejected 11:2, after which the present proposal was recommended <i>nem. con.</i></p> <p><i>Comments:</i></p>

Vote Number	6th Draft Article Number	Subject
		<p><i>For</i> Smith, Stuart & Conant (<i>Bull.</i> 27, p. 250-2, the original proposal), Melville (<i>Bull.</i> 35, p. 86), Houston group (7:3), Kansas group (7:0), Mayr</p> <p><i>Against</i> Bolton <i>et al</i> (<i>Bull.</i> 35, p. 145), Brooke (p. 86), Key (p. 148-9), Spilman (p. 150-1), Holthuis, Crosskey, Washington group (12:8), Copenhagen group, Ottawa group (4:2)</p> <p>Some comments said that all such names should end in a single -i, but this is not possible where the personal name in question already ends in -i (Martini, Bonarelli, Ishii). The labour of verifying original spellings is admittedly exasperating, but a liberating provision has proved difficult to draft and would require careful study and later report.</p>
10		<p>Multiple type specimens in cloned protozoa</p> <p><i>EC</i>: Recommended.</p> <p><i>Stenoffa</i>: Recommended <i>nem. con.</i></p> <p><i>Comments</i>: Few.</p> <p><i>For</i> Brooke, Corliss, Key, Holthuis, Washington group, Ottawa group (3:1), Kansas group (5:2).</p> <p><i>Against</i> Houston group (9:2)</p> <p>Discussion at the International Congresses of Protozoology and Parasitology (<i>Bull.</i> 35, pp. 200-208 in part) had shown that zoologists directly concerned favoured the proposal, if it was confined to certain extant species of protozoa in which the multiple type specimens were related clonally.</p>
11	73a-c 74b	<p>Published assumption of 'holotype' deemed to be lectotype designation</p> <p><i>EC</i>: Recommended.</p> <p><i>Stenoffa</i>: Recommended <i>nem. con.</i></p> <p><i>Comments</i>:</p> <p><i>For</i> Brooke, Galbraith, London group (large majority), Houston group (10:1), Ottawa group (7:0), Kansas group (6:1)</p>

Vote Number	6th Draft Article Number	Subject
		<p><i>Against</i></p> <p>Key (<i>Bull.</i> 35, p. 149), Crosskey, Washington group (16:1)</p> <p>This problem concerns cases where it is not clear whether a description is based on one specimen or more than one, and only a single original specimen is known to exist. There are three approaches: (1) published assumption of "holotype", this deemed to be lectotype designation if other syntypes are later discovered; (2) same published assumption, but specimen reverts to syntype status if others are discovered, and a lectotype must be designated; and (3) assumption that the sole specimen might have been a syntype and that it was effectively designated as lectotype. Method (2) is defended by Crosskey (<i>Bull. B.M.N.H. Entomol.</i>, vol. 30(5): 272-5 and (3) by Vane-Wright, <i>ibid.</i> vol. 32(2): 26-28. Method (3) is of course always binding. It is here recommended that if a 'holotype' was assumed and so published, it be deemed to have been designated as a lectotype if other syntypes are discovered.</p> <p>Cases occur where species thought to have been based on a single holotype are found to have been based on syntypes. If long usage, identifications and taxonomy have been based on an assumption found to be wrong, stability is probably best served by deeming the wrongly-assumed 'holotype' to be a lectotype. This is the solution proposed. The question only arises if and when additional syntypes are found; and the problem will be narrowed by making the proposed rule subject to Article 73a(iii).</p>
12	Entire Code	<p>Adoption of term 'epithet'</p> <p><i>EC:</i> Divided 3:2</p> <p><i>Stensoffa:</i> 8 for, 3 against, 2 abstentions.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><i>For</i></p> <p>Melville (<i>Bull.</i> 35, p. 83), Brooke (p. 84), Steyskal (p. 138), Galbraith, Washington group (30:15)</p> <p><i>Against</i></p> <p>Bolton <i>et al</i> (<i>Bull.</i> 35, p. 83), three Polish zoologists (p. 147), London group (large majority), Copenhagen group, Riley, Comm. int. Expl. sci. Méditerranée, Crosskey, Houston group (6:5),</p>

Vote Number	6th Draft Article Number	Subject
		Kansas group (4:2)
		<i>Arguments in favour</i>
		1. 'Epithet' avoids the confusion as to whether 'specific name' means a binomen or only the second term of a binomen (and similarly for 'subspecific name').
		2. It is shorter than 'species-group name' or 'name of the species group'.
		3. It is a step in the direction of harmonising zoological and botanical nomenclatural terminology.
		4. Its brevity and clarity make the habit of using it easy to acquire.
		<i>Arguments against</i>
		1. A change in terminology after 75 years would be unfortunate — no other term has been used for the second term of a binomen than 'specific name'.
		2. The meaning of 'species-group name' is said to be self-evident.
		3. The parallel construction in rules dealing with family-group, genus-group and species-group names would be lost.
		4. In botany, 'epithet' includes sub-generic names, and epithets are not regarded as names. Since zoologists cannot accept those propositions, the harmonisation is less evident than it might appear.
1	3	Clerck's 'Aranei svecici'
		<i>EC: Recommended.</i>
		<i>Stenoffa: Recommended, with one vote against.</i>
		<i>Comments:</i>
		None. This is a formal step to deal with apparent misinterpretation by arachnologists of Direction 104 and its antecedents.
2	10e	Secondary divisions of genera
		<i>EC: Recommended.</i>
		<i>Stenoffa: Recommended nem. con.</i>
		<i>Comments:</i>
		Cernohorsky (<i>Bull.</i> 36, p. 17), Kerzhner, Starobogatov, all in favour. The first two give evidence of general acceptance of such names in Insecta and Mollusca.

Vote Number	6th Draft Article Number	Subject
3	31	Restoration of Article 31 <i>EC</i> : Recommended. <i>Stenoffa</i> : Recommended <i>nem. con.</i> with the proviso that an author has the right to decide whether his epithet is to be treated as a Latin word or a modern patronymic, and in either case to decide what constitutes its stem. Mandatory correction is to apply to incorrectly formed genitives. <i>EC</i> was instructed to draft this provision so as to avoid conflict with Article 32a(ii). <i>Comments</i> : Spilman (<i>Bull.</i> 35, pp. 150-1), in favour. Eisenmann had some objections, answered by Sabrosky and not pursued. Kerzhner drew attention to drafting problems.
4	32d(iii)	Correction of family-group names <i>EC</i> : No clear view. <i>Stenoffa</i> : The Special Session took the view that this point was merely a corollary of Point 9 in V.P.(79)1 (deletion of Art. 29d) and therefore did not present it to the Section on Zoological Nomenclature at Helsinki. No vote is called for.
5	33b	Definition of 'demonstrably intentional' <i>EC</i> : Recommended. <i>Stenoffa</i> : Recommended 7:3 with 2 abstentions. <i>Comment</i> : Steyskal, <i>Bull.</i> vol. 35, p. 142, regards parts of the provision as too restrictive or ambiguous.
6	40	Correction of family-group names <i>EC</i> : Recommended <i>Stenoffa</i> : Recommended <i>nem. con.</i> <i>Comments</i> : None.
7	59c	Junior secondary homonyms <i>EC</i> : Recommended <i>Stenoffa</i> : Recommended <i>nem. con.</i> <i>Comments</i> : None.

At the close of the voting period on 19 May, votes had been received in the following order: Melville, Mroczkowski, Holthuis, Sabrosky, Ride, Kraus, Nye, Binder, Halvorsen, Corliss, Hahn, Bayer, Willink, Cogger, Tortonese, Vokes, Brinck, Starobogatov, Welch, Trjapitzin, Heppell, Alvarado, Bernardi. The state of the voting on each point was as follows:

		V.P.(80)1	
		For	Against
(1)	Article 8, Publication	20	3
(2)	Article 9, Publication	22	1
(3)	Article 9, Publication	20	3
(4)	Article 9, Publication	21	2
(5)	Article 9, Publication	19	3
(Holthuis voted "for" the first part of this proposal only)			
(6)	Article 9, Publication	22	1
(7a)	Article 30a. That Greek and non-classical epithets should be indeclinable	17	6
(7b)		22	1
(8)	Article 32d(i), Diacritic marks, especially umlauts	22	1
(9)	Article 33d, -i and -ii as incorrect subsequent spellings	21	2
(10)	Article 72, type slides in protozoa	23	0
(11)	Articles 73a-c, 74b. "Holotype" deemed in certain circumstances to be lectotype designation	22	1
(12)	Presentation of Code: adoption of term "epithet"	10	12
		V.P.(80)2	
(1)	Article 3, <i>Aranei svecici</i> of Clerck, 1757	20	2
		(One abstention)	
(2)	Article 10e, acceptance of names for both primary and secondary divisions of genera	23	0
(3)	Article 31, restoration of this Article	20	3
(4)	Article 32d(iii), correction of family-group names	(not formally put to vote)	
(5)	Article 33b, definition of "demonstrably intentional"	20	3
(6)	Article 40, status of family-group names based on emended generic names	23	0
(7)	Article 59c, junior secondary homonyms	20	3

No voting paper was returned by Habe. Dupuis abstained on all points.

The following comments were sent in by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

V.P.(80)1

Votes 1-6

Kraus (Vote 1): 'I strictly vote against for the reasons explained in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34, p. 168 by the Secretary: "In those fields where illustrations are important, microform methods are quite impracticable, for it is not feasible to use numerous readers in comparing illustrations with each other and with specimens (apart from considerations of expense and fatigue), and it is expensive and time-consuming to enlarge such originals to their true size. The results are, moreover, unreliable in quality . . .". As this, without any doubt, is the case, it seems inadequate to include such techniques only in the Recommendation on undesirable processes.'

Bayer (Vote 1): 'Instead of removing completely the "ink on paper" provision, can it not be retained as the preferable one of several alternatives? Although we cannot ignore technological advances, we should try to prevent them from degrading the traditional high standards of our science by making available to all comers the means to produce on the spur of the moment legally acceptable "publication" without any quality control whatever.'

Hahn (Votes 1-6): 'I think the Code should preserve the good old "ink on paper" version to constitute a publication – if not, I cannot see how to differentiate between modern methods that should be allowed and others that should not. If an author wishes to publish in microform or any other modern method, he should best publish a short notice in "ink on paper" so as to give nomenclatural status to his new taxa – a new taxon needs only half a page on average. Therefore I vote against 1, and especially 3 (microcard and microfiche) and 5 (xerography).'

Bayer (Vote 3): 'The drawback of photography as such as a method of duplicating verbal and graphic material (namely, that it is not permanent because it is prone to fading if not adequately processed) applies equally to microcards and microfiche, as they are nothing but photographs.'

Bayer (Vote 5): Accepting xerography (and similar processes) makes available to anyone with access to a typewriter and an electrostatic copier the means to make nomenclaturally acceptable copies without any restrictions or limitations to control quality, availability and date of publication. Even though it has always been possible to print privately (by press, as some have done, by offset lithography, by mimeographing) the cost and availability of the requisite equipment significantly limited the extent to which this was done; use of electrostatic copiers can be had at small cost in hundreds of places – from post offices to banks to duplicating shops, not to mention museums, schools and universities – almost anywhere in the world. Moreover, if the machine happens to mal-

function and the carbon is not satisfactorily fused to the paper, print will rub off and is even more ephemeral than hectographing (gelatine dye-transfer process).'

Holthuis (Vote 5): 'I vote for the first part ("photocopies ... reproductions") but against the second part ("unless ... Article 8").'

Votes 7a, 7b

Hahn (Vote 7a): 'I follow the arguments of Dr Steyskal that Greek names should be declined, but not other non-Latin names.'

Heppell (Votes 7a, 7b): 'So long as the masculine, feminine and neuter forms are treated as homonyms.'

Kraus (Vote 7b): 'In principle I vote for the proposal – provided that epithets derived from non-classical words or that are arbitrary combinations of letters, but have a Latin ending (-us, -a, -um), i.e. are latinised, will continue to be treated as declinable.'

Vote 8

Bayer: 'What happens in cases where unquestionably Latin names are spelled in German orthography so that the ae and oe diphthongs appear as ä and ö? Klunzinger, for one, did this in corals and crustaceans, including names of new taxa (e.g. 1913, *N. Acta Abh. K. Leop. Carol. deutsch. Akad. Naturforsch.* vol. 99 (2), p. 185, where *Actäa mäandrina* Klunzinger n. sp. appears instead of *Actaea maeandrina*).'

Willink: 'Retain Code.'

Vote 9

Tortonese: 'Concerning the endings -i or -ii, it would be very simple to state that the -i be used when there is no terminal -i (e.g. Smith, *smithi*; Bonelli, *bonellii*).'

Vote 10

Holthuis: 'I am for if the words "or presumed to form" are deleted.'

Vote 12

Kraus: 'Against for the reasons listed in the Appendix, page 6; arguments in favour are of minor importance.'

Tortonese: 'The choice of the word "epithet" was very unfortunate. We see no reason for abandoning the usual expression "specific name". With the proposed new situation, a greater importance seems to be given to the genus, and the species (the true reality in nature) is given a somewhat secondary role. In Italian and French, the term "epithet" commonly expresses bad feeling ("he is ignorant", "he is a fool"; these are epithets).'

Bayer: 'I have from the outset had doubts about the introduction of the term "epithet" into the Code. Although bringing the botanical and zoological procedures and terminologies closer together is a desirable goal, adoption of 'epithet' does not, upon closer scrutiny, effectively further this goal as our usage would require yet another concept of the term. Having thought in greater detail about the matter, I find that I now would not vote in favour of that proposal. As the voting period has not yet closed I would like to ask you to alter my vote to the negative.'

V.P.(80)2

Vote 4

Mroczkowski: 'I vote for deletion of Article 32d(iii) of the 6th Draft.'

Kraus: (A comment in the same sense).

Vote 5

Vokes: 'The words "or when two or more names in the same work are treated in a similar way" need clarification – perhaps by the use of examples.'

DECLARATION OF RESULT OF VOTE

The result of the vote on V.P.(80)1 and V.P.(80)2 is that all the points submitted for a vote except Point 12 in V.P.(80)1 received the two-thirds affirmative majority required under Article 16a(iv) of the Constitution. The publication of this report announces the intention of the Commission to incorporate the proposed amendments into the Code, in accordance with the authority given to it by the Division of Zoology of IUBS at Helsinki, and in words to be prepared by the Editorial Committee for the Commission's approval.

R.V. MELVILLE

Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

12 April 1980